UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,067	03/12/2004	Jared Pasha Jurkiewicz	RSW920030262US1	8430

36736   7590   06/29/2007

DUKE W. YEE
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER
STEELMAN, MARY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _31 March 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _31 March 2004_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _3/12/04, 10/10/06_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-20 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   IDS received 03/12/2004 & 10/10/2006 has been considered.

Specification

3.   Please fill in the blank on page 1 of the Specification.

The Abstract is to be limited to 150 words.

Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as

a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the

claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)),

the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if an abstract was

published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on

the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World

Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See

MPEP § 1893.03(e).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 4, 12, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4 & 12 recites the limitation "the filtering and adding" in line 1. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "the fourth and fifth instructions" in line 1. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5.   Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed

to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 17 recites a "computer program product in a computer readable medium" is not

limited to tangible storage devices in view of Specification, page 13, lines 6-19, which suggests

that such a medium may be a carrier wave or transmission medium (intangible). Accordingly,

claim 17 does not recite tangible manufactures, and are non-statutory subject matter.

As per claims 18-20, these claims are rejected for failing to cure the deficiencies of the

above rejected base claim 17.

Claim may be amended to recite, "A computer readable recordable media for creating an

Extensible-Style Language Transformation...", thereby claiming an embodiment that does not

include transmission type media / transmission forms / signals.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent

6,408,311 B1 to Bailey et al., in view of US Patent Application Publication 2002/0194220 A1 to

Sluiman.

Per claims 1, 9, and 17:

A method / apparatus / computer program product in a computer readable medium for creating

an Extensible-Style Language Transformation (XSLT) document from a plurality of Unified

Modeling Language (UML) model documents or Extensible Markup Language (XML) schemas

created from the plurality of UML model documents, the method comprising the steps of:

-providing a plurality of UML documents;

-determining at least one difference between a content of one UML document of said plurality of

UML documents and a content of a second UML document of said plurality of UML documents;

-creating an XSL fragment including said at least one difference between said content of said one

UML document of said plurality of UML documents and said content of said second UML

document of said plurality of UML documents.

Baisley disclosed a relationship between UML objects in a repository (Col. 2: 37-43) and XML

objects, including the ability to identify differences and synchronize the differences between

object models represented in different forms. Baisley disclosed (col. 2: 45) tracking changes to repository objects (UML objects) made by an external UML editing tool. Col. 6: 24-26, differences between the XML objects and the repository objects are identified.

Baisley failed to disclose determining the difference between the content of a first and second UML document, and creating a fragment including said difference.

However, Sluiman disclosed [0063], XSL transforms used to reconcile complex data models in the XML metalanguage. A data expander is capable of interpreting XSL Transforms. [0093], Reconciled data sets A' and B' (reconcile differences) are placed into C', a correct version of the divergent aspect (differences)...necessary for the purpose of obtaining metalanguage fragments for copying into fundamental data set C'. [0095], fundamental data expander 50 expands these reconciled aspects (differences) into corresponding metalanguage within new complex data model C. ([0003], metadata schema and data instances are referred to as complex data models.) [0034], a first transform is a set of instructions that controls which divergent aspects of the complex data models are to be extracted. If the received complex data models are in the XML metalanguage and the data extractor is capable of interpreting Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) Transforms (XSLTs), the transform may be an XSLT.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify Baisley, to include the teachings of Sluiman, because Baisley recognized the need (col. 2: 26-31) for generating format descriptions to expedite interchange of metadata

among repositories and modeling tools, automating the production of an XML DTD for meta

models (schema document).

Per claims 2, 10, and 18:

-the providing, determining and creating steps comprise the steps of:

-providing a plurality of XML schema documents from said plurality of UML documents;

Baisley disclosed related UML objects and XML objects.

Sluiman disclosed:

-determining at least one difference between a content of one XML schema document of said

plurality of XML schema documents and a content of a second XML schema document of said

plurality of XML schema documents;

-creating an XSL fragment including said at least one difference between said content of said one

XML schema document of said plurality of XML schema documents and said content of said

second XML schema document of said plurality of XML schema documents.

Sluiman: [0046], The received complex data models are metadata schema (content of XML

schema document) or data instances. [0048], data extraction represents divergent aspects of

complex data models A and B....are metalanguage files in the complex data model domain.

[0052], is converted to corresponding metalanguage file comprising fundamental data set C', a

metalanguage compilation of the favored versions of each divergent aspect, represents a

transformation of the reconciliation. [0034], The first transform may be an XSL transform. C',

the result of the original input reconciled data sets, is [0053] expanded into its full complex data

model equivalent. [0063], the second transform may also be an XSL Transform.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the

invention, to modify Baisley, to include the teachings of Sluiman, because Baisley recognized

the need (col. 2: 26-31) for generating format descriptions to expedite interchange of metadata

among repositories and modeling tools, automating the production of an XML DTD for meta

models (schema document).

Per claims 3, 11, and 19:

Baisley failed to explicitly disclose:

-filtering out at least one non-difference from said content of said one UML document of said

plurality of UML documents;

-adding said at least one difference to said content of said second UML document of said

plurality of UML documents.

However, Sluiman disclosed, as an example, [0078], ID information is extracted...despite the

fact that it is not divergent...to facilitate reconciliation in the semantic domain.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the

invention, to modify Baisley, to include the teachings of Sluiman, because Baisley recognized

the need (col. 2: 26-31) for generating format descriptions to expedite interchange of metadata

among repositories and modeling tools, automating the production of an XML DTD for meta

models (schema document).

Per claims 4, 12, and 20:

Baisley failed to explicitly disclose:

-the filtering and adding steps comprise the steps of:

-filtering out at least one non-difference from said content of said one XML schema document of

said plurality of XML schema documents;

-adding said at least one difference to said content of said second XML schema document of said

plurality of XML schema documents.

However, Sluiman disclosed, as an example, [0078], ID information is extracted...despite the

fact that it is not divergent...to facilitate reconciliation in the semantic domain. Filtering out ID

information to be used to facilitate reconciliation. [0079], the generated fundamental data sets

A' and B' include aspects of the received models that are to be differenced and merged (adding

said at least one difference to said content) during the immediate reconciliation, as well as non-

divergent (non-difference) aspects usable to facilitate reconciliation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the

invention, to modify Baisley, to include the teachings of Sluiman, because Baisley recognized

the need (col. 2: 26-31) for generating format descriptions to expedite interchange of metadata

among repositories and modeling tools, automating the production of an XML DTD for meta

models (schema document).

Per claims 5& 13:

-transforming a format of said one UML document to a format of said second UML document.

Baisley disclosed relating an XML object to an UML object, to maintain versioning, track

changes (col. 2: 56).

Per claims 6 & 14:

-said plurality of UML documents comprises two UML documents.

Baisley: See FIG. 3, repository objects (UML objects in repository, col. 2: 38).

Per claims 7 & 15:

-said content of said one UML document comprises configuration settings for an older version of

a product, and said content of said second UML document comprises configuration settings for a

newer version of said product.

Baisley: If a parsed XML object does not have a matching repository object (UML object) then

a new version of the repository object will be created. Col. 9: 10-27, A repository model is made

up of a package, comprises classes, and XML model is made up of a package, comprises

classes...Every object in the XML file will have a corresponding Conversion object and those

conversion objects will either have a repository ID that identifies the corresponding repository

object, or in the case where the is no corresponding object – NEW OBJECT will be set to TRUE.

Per claims 8 & 16:

-said content of said one UML document comprises a plurality of attributes for an older version

of a product, and said content of said second UML document comprises a plurality of attributes

for a newer version of said product.

Baisley: Col. 9: 10-25, If an object in the XML file does not have a corresponding repository ID

(does not have a newer version, only has an older version) a new object is created for the

corresponding repository.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

        Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Mary Steelman, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3704. The

examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday, from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM   If

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei

Zhen can be reached at (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned: 571-273-8300.

        Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be

directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mary Steelman

06/11/2007

MARY STEELMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER